

REMARKS**Summary Of The Office Action**

Claims 1, 5, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura (JP 2000-193936).

Claims 1 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozawa et al. (US 6,462,724).

Claims 9, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kurihara et al. (US 5,854,627).

Claims 5, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. in view of Kurihara et al.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 6 and 8 are allowed.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 6, 9, 14, 16, and 17 to further define the invention, canceled claims 1 and 5, and added new claims 18-23. Accordingly, claims 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 16-23 are presently pending for consideration.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments made to claim 6 are for purposes of improving form, and do not affect patentability of claims 6 and 8.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 5, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura (JP 2000-193936), claims 1 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozawa et al. (US 6,462,724), claims 9, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kurihara et al. (US 5,854,627), and claims 5, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa

et al. in view of Kurihara et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recites in independent claims 9 and 14, and hence dependent claims 12 and 16.

Initially, Applicant respectfully assert that the cancellation of claims 1 and 5 renders the rejections of claim 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) in view of Kimura and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Ozawa et al. moot.

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device including at least a switching unit selecting one of a first voltage and a second voltage output from a power converter, first and second output units and first and second common power units receiving the first and second voltages during reflective and transmissive driving modes of a liquid crystal display panel, respectively, and first and second common power units receiving the first and second voltages. Similarly, independent claim 14, as amended, recites a method for generating a reference voltage including at least steps of “providing the first voltage from the power converter to a first power unit and a first common power unit during a reflective driving mode of the liquid crystal display device to generate a first gamma voltage and a first common voltage,” “providing the second voltage received from the power converter to a second power unit and a second common power unit during a transmissive driving mode of the liquid crystal display to generate a second gamma voltage and a second common voltage,” and “providing one of the first gamma voltage and the second gamma voltage to the source driving circuit and one of the first common voltage and the second common voltage to the liquid crystal display device.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Kimura and Ozawa et al. both are completely silent with regard to a gamma reference voltage generating circuit that includes, in part, “a first common power unit receiving the first voltage and producing a first common

voltage during the reflective driving mode of the liquid crystal display panel” and “a second common power unit receiving the second voltage and producing a second common voltage during the transmissive driving mode of the liquid crystal display panel,” as recited by amended independent claim 9. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kimura and Ozawa et al. are both completely silent with regard to a method including, in part, steps of “providing the first voltage from the power converter to a first power unit and a first common power unit during a reflective driving mode of the liquid crystal display device to generate a first gamma voltage and a first common voltage,” “providing the second voltage received from the power converter to a second power unit and a second common power unit during a transmissive driving mode of the liquid crystal display to generate a second gamma voltage and a second common voltage,” and “providing one of the first gamma voltage and the second gamma voltage to the source driving circuit and one of the first common voltage and the second common voltage to the liquid crystal display device,” as recited by amended independent claim 14.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kurihara et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Kimura and Ozawa et al., as detailed above, since Kurihara et al. is also completely silent with regard to the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 9 and 14. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kurihara et al. neither teaches nor suggests first gamma and common voltages applied to a liquid crystal display device during a reflective driving mode and second gamma and common voltages applied to a liquid crystal display device during a transmissive mode. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kimura, Ozawa et al., and Kurihara et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to amended independent claims 9 and 14, and hence dependent claims 12, 16, and 17.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kimura, Ozawa et al., and/or Kurihara et al., whether taken singly or combined, either teaches or suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 9 and 14, and hence dependent claims 12, 13, 16, and 17.

New Claims 18-23

Applicant respectfully asserts that new claims 18-23 are allowable over the prior art for at least the reasons set forth above, and for the combination of features recited by at least new independent claim 18, and hence dependent claims 29-23.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: October 11, 2005

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000